

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-16 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,308,087 to Aoshima (Aoshima). Claims 1-7 and 9-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoshima in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,996,520 to Levin (Levin). Independent claims 1, 8, 9, and 16 have been amended to clarify that a signal received at a communications device from a network is a control signal that allows the communications device to synchronize to the network and which can assist in the receipt of a translational dictionary. Support for the amendments is found in the specification on page 6, lines 19-23 and on page 10, lines 7-13.

In contrast, Aoshima teaches a message receiving method that comprises the steps of judging whether a native language is used in a received message and translating the received message into the native language when it is determined that the native language is not used in the received message (col. 2, lines 40-45). Aoshima categorizes such a received message as an information message or a personal message (col. 4, lines 48-50). Exemplary information messages include weathercast information messages, traffic information messages, and sightseeing guide information messages (col. 4, lines 50-53), and a personal message is defined as an ordinary message transmitted from a person to another person (col. 4, lines 53-54). Clearly, the received messages described in Aoshima are not control signals used to allow a communications device to synchronize to a network, as claimed by Applicants.

Levin teaches the translation of input text from a source language to a target language. Levin states that the input text can be an electronic file or text entered by a

user (col. 14, lines 15-17), and that the source language can be determined using character recognition techniques on the input text (col. 14, lines 18-20). Levin never describes the determination of a source language from a control signal used to allow a communications device to synchronize to a network.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the above claims are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 15, 2007

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.  
Law Department – MD 1610  
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.  
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: /Larry G. Brown/  
Larry G. Brown

Attorney of Record  
Reg. No.: 45,834

Tel: 954-723-4295 direct line  
Tel: 954-723-6449 main line  
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871